

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	09/928,967	08/13/2001	Gerd Reime	944-003.100	7763
	4955 7590 07/19/2004			EXAMINER	
	WARE FRES	SOLA VAN DER SI	LUU, THANH X		
	ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224				
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2878	
	MONROE, C	Γ 06468			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/928,967	REIME ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Thanh X Luu	2878			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 28 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without cancell NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
∑ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>10,15 and 23</u> .					
Claim(s) objected to: 11-14,16,21,22,25,26 and 28-3	<u>1</u> .				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,5,7-9,17-20,24 and 27</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
B.☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10. Other:					
		Mul			
		Thanh X Luu Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2878			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not found to be persuasive. Nowhere in the claims does it state that the perpheral area is a part of the interaction area. On the contrary, since separate terms "interaction area" and "peripheral area" are used, as understood, Applicant is referring to different and distinct areas. Furthermore, if in fact a peripheral area is part of the interaction area, it is unclear where the peripheral area begins and the interaction area ends. Thus, since the application is not in condition for allowance, this advisory action is proper.